

**Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Planning and Progress Template**

**Green** - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned    **Yellow** - action has encountered minor obstacles    **Red** - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party(ies) and Partnerships	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Potential Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Resources Available		Resources Needed		Annual Progress to Date (2022)
							Technical	Financial	Technical	Financial	
<b>Priority Initiative 3: Riparian Buffers and Streams</b>											
3.1	Buffer Opportunities and Targeting Tool(s)	See P.I. 5 (Data management) for targeting tool metrics	Riparian Buffer (RB) Action Team (AT), Data Management (DM) Action Team (AT), Catchment Targeting (CT) Action Team (AT), County Planning (CCPC), Chester County Water Resources Authority (CCWRA)	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments	On-going with inherent tie to Priority Initiative (P.I.) 5	Potentially extend Lancaster County tools (developed by Chesapeake Conservancy) into Chester County (Octoraro already included in LC tool)  Assume BMP reconciliation can be achieved through targeting tool  Field verification required through Catchment Targeting Initiative as efforts progress through individual catchments	Chesapeake Conservancy, County, CCPC, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay (ACB), Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF), Technical Service Providers (TSPs), Chester County Conservation District (CCCD), Lancaster County Conservation District (LCCD), CCWRA, County DCIS (Dept. of Computer and Info. Services)	NFWF, Growing Greener (GG)		See DM AT (P.I. 5) targeting tool action item for more information	Met with Chesapeake Conservancy to discuss CWMT platform to capture BMP instances and potential BMP opportunities; Chester County analysis in progress.

3.2	Ag Riparian Zone	<p><i>Forest Buffer – 300 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Forest Buffer with exclusion fencing – 300 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Forest Buffer Narrow with exclusion fencing – 200 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Grass Buffer – 200 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Grass Buffer with exclusion fencing – 110 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Grass Buffer Narrow with exclusion fencing – 80 new acres</i></p>	<p>CCCD, TSPs, NRCS, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, ACB, CBF, Environ. Advisory Committees (EACs), Oxford Reg. Planning Comm., municipalities, MWS, CAPP, farmers</p>	<p>All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)</p>	<p>On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1 (catchment targeting)</p>	<p>Farmer resistance or buy-in</p> <p>Proposed implementation numbers need reconciled as general perception is proposed BMP rates are more than available or capable</p> <p>Buffers with exclusion fencing are exclusive to riparian corridors (and applied to pasture land uses); Buffers (no exclusion fencing) are not exclusive to riparian corridors and applied to crop, hay, turfgrass, and similar land uses (can be applied to field borders and similar upland scenarios). <b>Separate coding or definitions reflecting these conditions would be ideal.*</b></p>	<p>CCCD, NRCS, TSPs, Stroud, ACB, CBF, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy</p>	<p>NFWF, GG, DCNR, CREP, Keystone, TreeVitalize, PACD, RCPP, EQIP, Most Effective Basin Funding (MEBF), Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT)</p>		<p>Capital Cost: ~\$7.5 million</p>	<p>See progress notes for Action 3.1. Implementation occurs where farmers are receptive and implementation is appropriate. Riparian forest buffers have been implemented through the Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership.</p>
-----	------------------	---	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	-------------------------------------	---

3.3	Urban/ Developed Areas Riparian Zone	<p><i>MS4 Riparian Forest Buffers – 20 new acres</i></p> <p><i>Non-MS4 Forest Buffers – 30 new acres</i></p>	Local municipalities, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, Stroud, ACB, EACs, Oxford Reg. Planning Comm., CCCD, Octoraro Watershed Association (OWA)	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)	On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1 (catchment targeting)	<p>Landowner resistance or buy-in</p> <p>Watershed organizations or other non-profits to assist with Keystone implementation for small projects</p>	<p>CCCD, local municipalities, Stroud, ACB, CBF, watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, local engineers/ consultants, CCPC</p>	NFWF, GG, DCNR, Keystone, TreeVitalize, CBT		Capital Cost: ~\$200,000	<p>Implementation efforts pursued through Keystone 10 Million Trees: 22 acres implemented in Spring 2022 17 acres planned for Fall 2022</p> <p>TreeVitalize: 11 acres implemented in 2022 Grant opening for 2023 imminent</p>
3.4	"Buffer Bonus" Program	<i>Game plan by late 2021</i>	ACB, CBF, Stroud	All areas	Game plan for program development by late 2021	<p>Expand or mimic existing initiatives into Chester County</p> <p>Complement other funding streams for implementation coinciding with other BMPs</p>	ACB, CBF, Stroud, CCCD, TSPs, NRCS				2022 This has not been done yet. Primary challenge is staff time. Resources have mainly gone to Keystone 10 Million Trees Partnership Program.

3.5	Focused Stream Corridor BMP implementation	Urban Stream Restoration – 12,000 new LF	Local municipalities, TSPs, watershed groups, EACs, CCCD, developers	All areas with emphasis provided towards prioritized catchments (as catchments analyzed)	On-going with inherent tie to P.I. 1	Potential regional projects for PRP reductions distributed amongst multiple municipalities	CCCD, Trout Unlimited (TU), watershed groups, Brandywine Conservancy, local engineers/ consultants, Cecil Land Trust/EIP	NFWF, GG, CBT, PennVEST, MEBF, private		Capital Cost: ~\$13.9 million	Aware of three “large” stream restoration projects in development. 3 <sup>rd</sup> party entities (e.g. RES) exploring banking opportunities in the Bay watershed.
		Non-urban Stream Restoration – 22,430 new LF									
		Wetland Creation – 15 new acres									
		Wetland Restoration – 30 new acres									

### Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Planning and Progress Template

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

1. Inputs – These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.
2. Process – what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.
3. Outputs and outcomes – both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county. The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.
4. Implementation challenges – any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

**Asterisk:** Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

**For each Priority Initiative or Program Element:** Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the “who, what, where, when and how” of the plan:

**Description** = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

**Performance Target** = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

**Responsible Party(ies)** = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items through outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

**Geographic Location** = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. *NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.*

**Expected Timeline** = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

**Resources Available: Technical & Funding** = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

**Resources Needed: Technical & Funding** = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

**Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues** = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).